




Juvenile Justice Statistics



National Report Series

Bulletin

September 2016

This bulletin is part of the National Report Series. The National Report offers a comprehensive statistical overview of the problems of juvenile crime, violence, and victimization and the response of the juvenile justice system. The bulletins in the National Report Series provide access to the latest information on juvenile arrests, court cases, juveniles in custody, and other topics of interest. Each bulletin in the series highlights selected topics at the forefront of juvenile justice policymaking, giving readers focused access to statistics on some of the most critical issues. This series provides a baseline of facts for juvenile justice professionals, policymakers, the media, and concerned citizens.

Juvenile Residential Facility Census, 2014: Selected Findings

Sarah Hockenberry, Andrew Wachter, and Anthony Sladky

A Message From OJJDP

Every 2 years, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention conducts the Juvenile Residential Facility Census (JRFC) to collect information about the characteristics of facilities, including facility type, capacity, and type of security, in which youth charged with or adjudicated for law violations are held. Respondents also provide information on the types of evaluations and services they provide to youth entrusted to their care.

This bulletin provides findings from the 2014 survey. The population of justice system-involved youth dropped 11% from 2012 to 2014, to the lowest number since 1975. More of these youth were in local facilities on the census day in 2014 than were in state-operated facilities, continuing a trend that began with the 2012 census.

The 2014 JRFC data also describe the range of services that facilities provide to youth in their care. Almost all facilities (87%) reported that a portion of all residents attended some type of school. Most responding facilities routinely evaluated all residents for substance abuse (74%), mental health needs (58%), and suicide risk (90%).

Our Office has a vision for juvenile justice reform that supports state and local efforts to address the problems that system-involved youth face. This bulletin helps the juvenile justice field to track conditions of confinement and the progress that states and communities are making to ensure that system-involved youth receive the treatment and services that they need.

Robert L. Listenbee
Administrator



Access OJJDP publications online at ojjdp.gov

The Juvenile Residential Facility Census provides data on facility operations

Facility census describes 2,429 juvenile facilities

In October 2014, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) administered the eighth Juvenile Residential Facility Census (JRFC). JRFC began in 2000 with data collections occurring every other year. JRFC routinely collects data on how facilities operate and the services they provide. It includes questions on facility ownership and operation, security, capacity and crowding, and injuries and deaths in custody. The census also collects supplementary information each year on specific services, such as mental and physical health, substance abuse, and education.

JRFC does not capture data on adult prisons or jails, nor does it include facilities

used exclusively for mental health or substance abuse treatment or for dependent children. Thus, JRFC includes most, but not all, facilities that hold justice-involved youth (i.e., youth who were charged with or adjudicated for law violations). The reporting facilities may also hold adults or youth held for nonoffense reasons (e.g., abuse/neglect, mental health/substance abuse problems), but data were included only if the facility held at least one justice-involved youth on the census date.

The 2014 JRFC collected data from 2,429 juvenile facilities. Analyses in this bulletin were based only on data from facilities housing justice-involved youth on the census date (October 22, 2014); 1,852 facilities were included in the analyses. Excluded from the analyses were data from 1 facility in the Virgin Islands, 13

tribal facilities, and 563 facilities that held no justice-involved youth on that date.

The 1,852 facilities housed a total of 50,821 justice-involved youth who were younger than 21 on the census date. This represents the fewest such youth in residential placement since the 1975 Children in Custody Census (the predecessor data collection to the JRFC and its companion collection, the Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement), which reported 52,726 justice-involved youth in juvenile facilities on the census date. From 1975 to 2000, the data collections recorded increasingly larger 1-day counts of justice-involved youth in public and private residential placement facilities. From 2000 to 2014, those increases were erased, resulting in the lowest census population recorded since 1975.

On October 22, 2014, 54% of juvenile facilities were publicly operated; they held 71% of justice-involved youth

State	Juvenile facilities			Justice-involved youth			State	Juvenile facilities			Justice-involved youth		
	Total	Public	Private	Total	Public	Private		Total	Public	Private	Total	Public	Private
U.S. total	1,852	1,008	844	50,821	36,110	14,711	Missouri	59	52	7	928	875	53
Alabama	43	14	29	948	484	464	Montana	16	7	9	158	118	40
Alaska	17	8	9	199	159	40	Nebraska	12	5	7	586	304	282
Arizona	19	14	5	1,037	677	360	Nevada	20	12	8	597	518	79
Arkansas	33	18	15	777	544	233	New Hampshire	4	–	–	63	–	–
California	169	97	72	7,019	6,144	875	New Jersey	29	25	4	774	732	42
Colorado	35	15	20	1,107	851	256	New Mexico	22	15	7	423	357	66
Connecticut	5	–	–	213	–	–	New York	99	22	77	1,524	585	939
Delaware	6	6	0	154	154	0	North Carolina	27	21	6	463	394	69
Dist. of Columbia	11	5	6	214	179	35	North Dakota	10	4	6	115	90	25
Florida	76	29	47	2,914	1,165	1,749	Ohio	74	60	14	2,241	2,084	157
Georgia	29	25	4	1,390	1,281	109	Oklahoma	30	18	12	528	393	135
Hawaii	4	–	–	55	–	–	Oregon	58	32	26	1,080	809	271
Idaho	20	13	7	477	392	85	Pennsylvania	114	24	90	3,233	713	2,520
Illinois	31	26	5	1,704	1,585	119	Rhode Island	7	2	5	188	127	61
Indiana	55	32	23	1,454	944	510	South Carolina	19	8	11	670	394	276
Iowa	53	10	43	977	280	697	South Dakota	16	7	9	313	169	144
Kansas	26	13	13	667	536	131	Tennessee	26	18	8	691	502	189
Kentucky	36	28	8	711	619	92	Texas	90	69	21	4,324	3,691	633
Louisiana	30	16	14	841	654	187	Utah	30	17	13	579	371	208
Maine	3	–	–	133	–	–	Vermont	2	–	–	29	–	–
Maryland	29	15	14	685	471	214	Virginia	45	–	–	1,484	–	–
Massachusetts	52	23	29	506	248	258	Washington	36	31	5	958	908	50
Michigan	58	30	28	1,868	980	888	West Virginia	41	10	31	637	261	376
Minnesota	50	18	32	930	545	385	Wisconsin	48	22	26	845	621	224
Mississippi	14	14	0	195	195	0	Wyoming	14	5	9	215	137	78

Notes: "State" is the state where the facility is located. Youth sent to out-of-state facilities are counted in the state where the facility is located, not the state where they committed their offense. Detail is not displayed in states with one or two private facilities to preserve the privacy of individual facilities.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

Nearly half of facilities were private, but most justice-involved youth were in public facilities

Local facilities were more numerous, but state facilities held nearly as many youth

Historically, local facilities (those staffed by county, city, or municipal employees) held fewer justice-involved youth than state facilities, even though they comprised more than half of all public facilities. In recent years, the gap narrowed and, in 2014, local facilities held more youth than state facilities.

	Facilities		Justice-involved youth	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	1,852	100%	50,821	100%
Public	1,008	54	36,110	71
State	390	21	17,200	34
Local	618	33	18,910	37
Private	844	46	14,711	29

Note: Detail may not total 100% because of rounding.

In 2014, JRFC asked facilities if a for-profit agency owned and/or operated them. Of reporting facilities, only a small percentage said that these types of agencies owned (4%) or operated (7%) them. In both cases, these facilities tended to hold 100 or fewer residents and were most likely to classify themselves as residential treatment centers.

Residential treatment centers and detention centers outnumbered other types of facilities

JRFC asks respondents to identify the type of facility—detention center, shelter, reception/diagnostic center, group home/halfway house, boot camp, ranch/forestry/wilderness camp/marine program, training school/long-term secure facility, or residential treatment center. JRFC allowed respondents to select more than one facility type, although the vast majority

Training schools tend to be state facilities, detention centers tend to be local facilities, and group homes tend to be private facilities

Facility operation	Total	Facility type						
		Detention center	Shelter	Reception/diagnostic center	Group home	Ranch/wilderness camp	Training school	Residential treatment center
Number of facilities	1,852	664	143	61	360	37	176	726
Operations profile								
All facilities	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Public	54	92	38	72	19	76	91	33
State	21	21	3	56	7	22	68	19
Local	33	71	35	16	12	54	24	14
Private	46	8	62	28	81	24	9	67
Facility profile								
All facilities	100%	36%	8%	3%	19%	2%	10%	39%
Public	100	61	5	4	7	3	16	24
State	100	36	1	9	6	2	31	36
Local	100	76	8	2	7	3	7	16
Private	100	6	11	2	35	1	2	57

■ Detention centers, reception/diagnostic centers, ranch/wilderness camps, and training schools were more likely to be public facilities than private facilities; however, a substantial proportion of reception/diagnostic centers and ranch/wilderness camps were private.

■ Most shelters, group homes, and residential treatment centers were private facilities.

■ Detention centers made up the largest proportion of all local facilities and nearly two-thirds of all public facilities.

■ Detention centers and residential treatment centers accounted for the largest proportions of all state facilities (36% each); training schools accounted for 31%.

■ Residential treatment centers accounted for 57% of all private facilities, and group homes accounted for 35%.

Note: Counts (and row percentages) may sum to more than the total number of facilities because facilities could select more than one facility type.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

(85%) selected only one. Nearly 730 facilities identified themselves as residential treatment centers and were holding justice-involved youth on the 2014 census date. Residential treatment centers made up 39% of all facilities and held 37% of justice-involved youth. There were 664 facilities that identified themselves as detention centers—they accounted for 36% of facilities and held 44% of justice-involved youth in residential placement on the census date. Facilities identified as detention centers most commonly also

identified themselves as residential treatment centers (62 facilities), training schools (42), and shelters (28). There were 360 facilities that identified themselves as group homes/halfway houses and were holding justice-involved youth. Group homes made up 19% of facilities and held 8% of such youth. There were 60 facilities that identified themselves as both residential treatment centers and group homes, the most common type of facility combination.

Security features and size varied across types of facilities

Facilities varied in their degree of security

Overall, 45% of facilities said that, at least some of the time, they locked youth in their sleeping rooms. Among public facilities, 80% of local facilities and 66% of state facilities reported locking youth in sleeping rooms. Few private facilities locked youth in sleeping rooms (7%).

Percentage of facilities locking youth in sleeping rooms

Total	45%
Public	75
State	66
Local	80
Private	7

Note: Percentages are based on facilities that reported security information (41 of 1,852 facilities [2%] did not report).

Among facilities that locked youth in sleeping rooms, most did this at night (87%) or when a youth was out of control (79%). Locking doors whenever youth were in their sleeping rooms (61%) and locking youth in their rooms during shift changes (51%) were also fairly common. Fewer facilities reported locking youth in sleeping rooms for a part of each day (23%) or when they were suicidal (21%). Very few facilities reported that they locked youth in sleeping rooms most of each day (1%) or all of each day (less than 1%). Nine percent (9%) had no set schedule for locking youth in sleeping rooms.

Facilities indicated whether they had various types of locked doors or gates to confine youth within the facility (see sidebar, this page). More than half of all facilities that reported security information said they had one or more confinement features (other than locked sleeping rooms). A greater proportion of public facilities (85%) than private facilities (25%) had confinement features.

Percentage of facilities

	No confinement features	One or more confinement features
--	-------------------------	----------------------------------

Total	42%	58%
Public	15	85
State	16	84
Local	15	85
Private	75	25

Note: Percentages are based on facilities that reported security information (41 of 1,852 facilities [2%] did not report).

Among detention centers and training schools that reported security information, more than 9 in 10 said they had one or more confinement features (other than locked sleeping rooms).

Facilities reporting one or more confinement features (other than locked sleeping rooms):

Facility type	Number	Percentage
Total facilities	1,051	58%
Detention center	634	95
Shelter	38	27
Reception/diagnostic center	50	82
Group home	44	13
Ranch/wilderness camp	14	38
Training school	165	94
Residential treatment center	320	45

Note: Detail sums to more than totals because facilities could select more than one facility type.

Among group homes, 1 in 8 facilities said they had locked doors or gates to confine youth. A facility's staff, of course, also provides security. In some facilities, a remote location is a security feature that also helps to keep youth from leaving.

Overall, 25% of facilities reported external gates in fences or walls with razor wire. This arrangement was most common among training schools (50%), detention centers (47%), and reception/diagnostic centers (39%).

JRFC asks facilities about their security features

Are any young persons in this facility locked in their sleeping rooms by staff at any time to confine them?

Does this facility have any of the following features intended to confine young persons within specific areas?

- Doors for secure day rooms that are locked by staff to confine young persons within specific areas?
- Wing, floor, corridor, or other internal security doors that are locked by staff to confine young persons within specific areas?
- Outside doors that are locked by staff to confine young persons within specific buildings?
- External gates in fences or walls WITHOUT razor wire that are locked by staff to confine young persons?
- External gates in fences or walls WITH razor wire that are locked by staff to confine young persons?

Are outside doors to any buildings with living/sleeping units in this facility ever locked? If yes, why?

- To keep intruders out?
- To keep young persons inside this facility?

JRFC did not ask about security features such as resident counts (roll calls), cameras, or guard towers.

Security increased as facility size increased

Among the largest facilities (those with more than 200 residents) that provided security information, 73% locked youth in their sleeping rooms to confine them at least some of the time. The vast majority of large facilities (82%) had one or more features (locked doors or gates) to confine youth.

Facility size	Percentage of facilities reporting		
	Youth locked in sleep rooms	One or more confinement features	Razor wire
Total facilities	45%	58%	25%
1–10 residents	24	33	10
11–20 residents	43	59	23
21–50 residents	58	73	35
51–100 residents	64	77	40
101–200 residents	70	85	49
201+ residents	73	82	59

Although the use of razor wire is a far less common security measure, nearly 6 in 10 of the largest facilities said they had locked gates in fences or walls with razor wire.

Large facilities were most likely to be state operated

Few (18%) state-operated facilities (70 of 390) held 10 or fewer residents in 2014. In contrast, 44% of private facilities (369 of 844) were that small. In fact, these small private facilities made up the largest proportion of private facilities.

Facility size	Facility operation		
	State	Local	Private
Total facilities	390	618	844
1–10 residents	70	162	369
11–20 residents	78	158	200
21–50 residents	142	195	170
51–100 residents	56	77	79
101–200 residents	34	20	20
201+ residents	10	6	6

More than half of facilities were small (holding 20 or fewer residents), although more than half of justice-involved youth were held in medium facilities (holding 21–100 residents)

Facility size	Number of facilities	Percentage of facilities	Number of youth	Percentage of youth
Total facilities	1,852	100%	50,821	100%
1–10 residents	601	32	3,176	6
11–20 residents	436	24	5,559	11
21–50 residents	507	27	14,623	29
51–100 residents	212	11	12,743	25
101–200 residents	74	4	8,952	18
201+ residents	22	1	5,768	11

■ Although the largest facilities—those holding more than 200 residents—accounted for 1% of all facilities, they held 11% of all youth in placement.

■ Inversely, although the smallest facilities—those holding 10 or fewer residents—accounted for 32% of all facilities, they held 6% of all youth in residential placement.

Note: Column percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding. “Youth” refers to justice-involved youth.

Source: Authors’ analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

Among group homes, those holding 20 or fewer residents were most common

Facility size	Facility type						
	Detention center	Shelter	Reception/diagnostic center	Group home	Ranch/wilderness camp	Training school	Residential treatment center
Number of facilities	664	143	61	360	37	176	726
Total facilities	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
1–10 residents	23	54	25	64	8	5	25
11–20 residents	26	26	10	23	16	10	24
21–50 residents	32	13	26	10	54	35	32
51–100 residents	14	4	18	3	19	29	14
101–200 residents	4	3	13	1	0	18	4
201+ residents	1	1	8	1	3	5	1

■ 64% of group homes and 54% of shelters held 10 or fewer residents. For other facility types, this proportion was 25% or less.

■ 8% of reception/diagnostic centers and 5% of training schools held more than 200 residents. For other facility types, this proportion was 3% or less.

Note: Facility type counts sum to more than 1,852 facilities because facilities could select more than one facility type. Column percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Source: Authors’ analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

State-operated facilities made up 21% of all facilities and accounted for 45% of facilities holding more than 200 residents.

Private facilities constituted 46% of all facilities and accounted for 61% of facilities holding 10 or fewer residents.

Facility crowding affected a relatively small proportion of youth in custody

One in five youth were in facilities that were at or over their standard bed capacity

Facilities reported both the number of standard beds and the number of makeshift beds they had on the census date. Occupancy rates provide the broadest assessment of the adequacy of living space. Although occupancy rate standards have not been established, as a facility's occupancy surpasses 100%, operational functioning may be compromised.

Crowding occurs when the number of residents occupying all or part of a facility exceeds some predetermined limit based on square footage, utility use, or even fire codes. Although it is an imperfect measure of crowding, comparing the number of residents to the number of standard beds gives a sense of the crowding problem in a facility. Even without relying on makeshift beds, a facility may be crowded. For example, using standard beds in an infirmary for youth who are not sick or beds in seclusion for youth who have not committed infractions may indicate crowding problems.

Twenty-two percent (22%) of facilities said that the number of residents they held on the 2014 census date put them at or over the capacity of their standard beds or that they relied on some makeshift beds. These facilities held 11,684 residents, the vast majority of whom were justice-involved youth younger than 21. Thus, 20% of all residents held on the census date and 20% of justice-involved youth younger than 21 were held in facilities operating at or above their standard bed capacity. In comparison, such facilities held 17% of all residents in 2012, and they held 40% in 2000. In 2014, 4% of

Compared with other types of private facilities, detention centers and training schools were more likely to be over their standard bed capacity

Facility type	Percentage of facilities at their standard bed capacity			Percentage of facilities over their standard bed capacity		
	Total	Public	Private	Total	Public	Private
Total	18%	13%	24%	4%	3%	4%
Detention center	11	10	19	4	4	8
Shelter	14	17	12	3	0	6
Reception/diagnostic center	18	18	18	0	0	0
Group home	23	16	25	4	4	4
Ranch/wilderness camp	8	7	11	0	0	0
Training school	13	11	27	3	2	7
Residential treatment center	23	21	24	3	2	3

Note: A single bed is counted as one standard bed, and a bunk bed is counted as two standard beds. Makeshift beds (e.g., cots, rollout beds, mattresses, and sofas) are not counted as standard beds. Facilities are counted as over capacity if they reported more residents than standard beds or if they reported any occupied makeshift beds. Facilities could select more than one facility type.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

Facilities holding between 101 and 200 residents were the most likely to be crowded

Facility size	Number of facilities	Percentage of facilities under, at, or over their standard bed capacity			Mean number of makeshift beds at facilities over capacity
		<100%	100%	>100%	
Total facilities	1,852	78%	18%	4%	2
1–10 residents	601	76	21	3	1
11–20 residents	436	78	19	3	2
21–50 residents	507	79	17	4	2
51–100 residents	212	83	12	5	2
101–200 residents	74	80	12	8	6
201+ residents	22	82	18	0	0

Note: A single bed is counted as one standard bed, and a bunk bed is counted as two standard beds. Makeshift beds (e.g., cots, rollout beds, mattresses, and sofas) are not counted as standard beds. Facilities are counted as over capacity if they reported more residents than standard beds or if they reported any occupied makeshift beds. Facilities could select more than one facility type.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

facilities reported being over capacity (having fewer standard beds than they had residents or relying on makeshift

beds). These facilities held 5% of justice-involved youth.

Private facilities were more likely than public facilities to be crowded

Among privately operated facilities, 4% exceeded standard bed capacity or had residents occupying makeshift beds on the 2014 census date. For publicly operated facilities, the proportion was 3%. In addition, a larger proportion of private facilities (24%) compared with public facilities (13%) said they were operating at 100% capacity.

Equal proportions of locally and state operated public facilities exceeded capacity (3%).

Facility operation	Percentage of facilities at or over their standard bed capacity		
	≥100	100	>100
Total	22	18	4
Public	16	13	3
State	21	18	3
Local	13	10	3
Private	28	24	4

Note: Detail may not add to totals because of rounding.

Use of makeshift beds varied widely

There were 65 facilities that reported having occupied makeshift beds, averaging 2 such beds per facility. Although some facilities rely on makeshift beds, many others operate well below standard bed capacity. On average, there were 15 unoccupied standard beds per facility. This average masks a wide range: 1 facility with 57 residents had 27 standard beds and 30 residents without standard beds; another facility with 776 standard beds had 231 residents, leaving 545 unoccupied beds.

Nationwide, 400 juvenile facilities (22%) were at or over standard capacity or relied on makeshift beds

State	Total facilities	Number of facilities under, at, or over capacity			Percentage of youth in facilities at or over capacity		State	Total facilities	Number of facilities under, at, or over capacity			Percentage of youth in facilities at or over capacity	
		<100%	100%	>100%	100%	>100%			<100%	100%	>100%	100%	>100%
U.S. total	1,852	1,452	335	65	15%	5%	Missouri	59	46	12	1	22%	3%
Alabama	43	32	11	0	19	0	Montana	16	11	2	3	37	15
Alaska	17	15	1	1	1	4	Nebraska	12	9	2	1	20	6
Arizona	19	18	1	0	2	0	Nevada	20	14	4	2	9	23
Arkansas	33	21	12	0	48	0	New Hampshire	4	4	0	0	0	0
California	169	133	36	0	7	0	New Jersey	29	23	6	0	21	0
Colorado	35	28	4	3	3	17	New Mexico	22	21	0	1	0	2
Connecticut	5	4	1	0	23	0	New York	99	73	24	2	13	4
Delaware	6	6	0	0	0	0	North Carolina	27	20	7	0	26	0
Dist. of Columbia	11	5	1	5	4	83	North Dakota	10	10	0	0	0	0
Florida	76	47	14	15	19	21	Ohio	74	59	8	7	13	14
Georgia	29	22	4	3	15	14	Oklahoma	30	17	13	0	40	0
Hawaii	4	4	0	0	0	0	Oregon	58	46	11	1	13	5
Idaho	20	18	1	1	0	1	Pennsylvania	114	90	23	1	19	0
Illinois	31	26	4	1	10	0	Rhode Island	7	3	3	1	13	60
Indiana	55	50	5	0	13	0	South Carolina	19	18	1	0	5	0
Iowa	53	41	12	0	44	0	South Dakota	16	14	2	0	13	0
Kansas	26	21	4	1	7	3	Tennessee	26	20	4	2	4	3
Kentucky	36	28	7	1	20	1	Texas	90	83	5	2	8	4
Louisiana	30	22	7	1	36	1	Utah	30	25	5	0	22	0
Maine	3	3	0	0	0	0	Vermont	2	2	0	0	0	0
Maryland	29	22	7	0	14	0	Virginia	45	37	7	1	11	0
Massachusetts	52	43	8	1	23	1	Washington	36	26	8	2	47	3
Michigan	58	48	8	2	10	4	West Virginia	41	23	17	1	36	0
Minnesota	50	39	11	0	9	0	Wisconsin	48	38	10	0	52	0
Mississippi	14	13	1	0	4	0	Wyoming	14	11	1	2	1	4

Note: A single bed is counted as one standard bed, and a bunk bed is counted as two standard beds. Makeshift beds (e.g., cots, rollout beds, mattresses, and sofas) are not counted as standard beds. Facilities are counted as over capacity if they reported more residents than standard beds or if they reported any occupied makeshift beds. Facilities could select more than one facility type. "State" is the state where the facility is located. Youth sent to out-of-state facilities are counted in the state where the facility is located, not the state where they committed their offense. "Youth" refers to justice-involved youth.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

Most youth were evaluated for educational needs and attended school while held in facilities

Facilities that screened all youth for educational needs held 83% of the youth in custody

As part of the information collected on educational services, the JRFC questionnaire asked facilities about their procedures regarding educational screening.

In 2014, 87% of facilities that reported educational screening information said that they evaluated all youth for grade level and educational needs. An additional 4% evaluated some youth. Only 9% did not evaluate any youth for educational needs.

Of the 62 facilities in 2014 that screened some but not all youth, 80% evaluated youth whom staff identified as needing an assessment, 63% evaluated youth with known educational problems, 71% evaluated youth for whom no educational record was available, and 18% evaluated youth who came directly from home rather than from another facility.

In 2014, those facilities that screened all youth held 83% of the justice-involved youth in custody. An additional 2% of such youth in 2014 were in facilities that screened some youth.

Most facilities used previous academic records to evaluate educational needs

The vast majority of facilities (91%) that screened some or all youth for grade level and educational needs used previous academic records. Some facilities also administered written tests (62%) or conducted an education-related interview with an education specialist (57%), intake counselor (38%), or guidance counselor (25%).

The smallest facilities were the least likely to evaluate all youth for grade level

Education screening	Facility size based on residential population						
	Total	1–10	11–20	21–50	51–100	101–200	201+
Total facilities	1,852	601	436	507	212	74	22
Facilities reporting	1,630	514	393	451	182	68	22
All reporting facilities	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All youth screened	87	79	90	91	92	97	91
Some youth screened	4	5	4	2	4	3	0
No youth screened	9	16	6	6	4	0	9

■ Facilities holding 101–200 youth were the most likely facility size to evaluate all youth for grade level in 2014.

Note: Column percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

Most facilities evaluated youth for grade level between 24 hours and 7 days after arrival

When youth are evaluated for educational needs	Number of juvenile facilities			As a percentage of facilities that evaluated youth for grade level		
	All facilities	All youth evaluated	Some youth evaluated	Facilities that evaluated	All youth evaluated	Some youth evaluated
Total facilities	1,852	1,426	62	100%	96%	4%
Less than 24 hours	323	313	9	22	21	1
24 hours to 7 days	1,179	1,131	42	79	76	3
7 or more days	107	97	9	7	7	1
Other	39	28	10	3	2	1
No youth evaluated (or not reported)	356	–	–	–	–	–

Note: Facilities sum to more than 1,852 because they could select more than one time period.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

Most facilities reported that youth in their facility attended school

Eighty-seven percent (87%) of facilities reported that at least some youth in their facility attended school either inside or outside the facility. Facilities reporting that all youth attended school (68% of facilities) accounted for 66% of the

justice-involved youth population in residential placement. Group homes were the least likely to report that all youth attended school (53%) and the most likely to report that no youth attended school (20%). Facilities with 21–50 residents were most likely to report that all youth attended school (71%), while facilities with 201+ residents were least likely (55%) to have all youth attend school. Facilities reporting

Group homes and small facilities were the least likely to report that youth in their facility attended school

Facility type	Total	Percentage of facilities with youth attending school		
		All youth	Some youth	No youth
Total facilities	100%	68%	20%	13%
Detention center	100	75	16	9
Shelter	100	69	22	10
Reception/diagnostic center	100	62	30	8
Group home	100	53	26	20
Ranch/wilderness camp	100	62	38	0
Training school	100	70	22	8
Residential treatment center	100	70	18	12
Facility size				
1–10 residents	100%	64%	21%	15%
11–20 residents	100	70	19	10
21–50 residents	100	71	18	12
51–100 residents	100	68	18	14
101–200 residents	100	64	27	9
201+ residents	100	55	45	0

Note: Row percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

that no youth attended school (13%) accounted for 11% of all justice-involved youth in residential placement.

Facilities offered a variety of educational services

Facilities that provided both middle and high school-level education housed 89% of all justice-involved youth. Eighty-seven percent (87%) of all facilities provided high school-level education, and 78% provided middle school-level education. Most facilities also reported offering special education services (77%) and GED preparation (67%). A much smaller percentage of facilities provided vocational or technical education (34%) and post-high school education (30%).

In 2014, facilities were asked if they communicated information regarding the education status, services, and/or needs to the young person's new placement or residence; 81% of facilities said that they did. Most of these (87%) said that they communicated education status information for all youth departing the facility.

Most facilities provided middle and high school-level education

Education level	Facility type							
	All facilities	Detention center	Shelter	Reception/diagnostic center	Group home	Ranch/wilderness camp	Training school	Residential treatment center
Elementary level	45%	67%	55%	48%	19%	38%	44%	41%
Middle school	78	88	87	80	65	81	85	77
High school	87	91	90	90	79	100	92	87
Special education	77	78	81	82	68	89	89	80
GED preparation	67	66	67	74	65	89	84	71
GED testing	46	35	46	54	51	59	69	52
Post-high school	30	19	29	38	39	54	57	34
Vocational/technical	34	14	29	39	42	62	64	43
Life skills training	57	49	48	66	60	73	70	64

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

Most facilities reported screening youth for substance abuse problems

Facilities that screened all youth held 67% of the justice-involved youth in custody

In 2014, 74% of facilities that reported substance abuse evaluation information said that they evaluated all youth, 14% said that they evaluated some youth, and 13% did not evaluate any youth.

Of the 224 facilities that evaluated some but not all youth, 88% evaluated youth that the court or a probation officer identified as potentially having substance abuse problems, 72% evaluated youth that facility staff identified as potentially having substance abuse problems, and 58% evaluated youth charged with or adjudicated for a drug- or alcohol-related offense.

Those facilities that screened all youth held 67% of the justice-involved youth in custody. An additional 13% of such youth were in facilities that screened some youth.

The most common form of evaluation was a series of staff-administered questions

The majority of facilities (74%) that evaluated some or all youth for substance abuse problems had staff administer a series of questions that ask about substance use and abuse, 58% visually observed youth to evaluate them, 53% used a self-report checklist inventory that asks about substance use and abuse to evaluate youth, and 39% said they used a standardized self-report instrument, such as the Substance Abuse Subtle Screening Inventory.

The largest facilities were the least likely to evaluate all youth for substance abuse problems

Substance abuse screening	Facility size based on residential population						
	Total	1-10	11-20	21-50	51-100	101-200	201+
Total facilities	1,852	601	436	507	212	74	22
Facilities reporting	1,630	514	393	451	182	68	22
All reporting facilities	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All youth screened	74	73	72	75	74	76	68
Some youth screened	14	13	13	13	19	13	23
No youth screened	13	14	15	13	7	10	9

Note: Column percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

More than half of facilities reported evaluating youth for substance abuse within their first day at the facility

When youth are evaluated for substance abuse	Number of juvenile facilities			As a percentage of facilities that evaluated youth for substance abuse		
	All facilities	All youth evaluated	Some youth evaluated	Facilities that evaluated	All youth evaluated	Some youth evaluated
Total facilities	1,852	1,199	224	100%	84%	16%
Less than 24 hours	888	821	67	62	58	5
24 hours to 7 days	541	457	84	38	32	6
7 or more days	138	72	66	10	5	5
Other	85	42	43	6	3	3
No youth evaluated (or not reported)	429	—	—	—	—	—

Note: Facilities sum to more than 1,852 because they were able to select more than one time period.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

Drug testing was a routine procedure in most facilities in 2014

As part of the information collected on substance abuse services, JRFC asked facilities if they required any youth to undergo drug testing after they arrived at the

facility. The majority of facilities (72%) reported that they required at least some youth to undergo drug testing. Of facilities that reported testing all or some youth, the most common reason for testing was because of a request from the court or the probation officer (63% for facilities that tested all youth, 72% for facilities that

tested youth suspected of recent drug or alcohol use, and 68% for facilities that tested youth with substance abuse problems).

Circumstances of testing	Percentage of facilities
All youth	
After initial arrival	28%
At each reentry	23
Randomly	28
When drug use is suspected or drug is present	50
At the request of the court or probation officer	63
Youth suspected of recent drug/alcohol use	
After initial arrival	34%
At each reentry	26
Randomly	33
When drug use is suspected or drug is present	57
At the request of the court or probation officer	72
Youth with substance abuse problems	
After initial arrival	27%
At each reentry	24
Randomly	33
When drug use is suspected or drug is present	52
At the request of the court or probation officer	68

In 2014, JRFC asked facilities if they communicated information regarding the substance abuse status, services, and/or needs to the young person's new placement or residence; 56% of facilities said that they did. Of these facilities, many (73%) said that they communicated substance abuse status information for all youth departing the facility.

Substance abuse education was the most common service provided at all reporting facilities

Substance abuse service	Facility size based on residential population						
	Total	1-10	11-20	21-50	51-100	101-200	201+
Total facilities	1,852	601	436	507	212	74	22
Facilities reporting	1,282	398	293	359	151	61	20
Substance abuse education	96%	95%	95%	96%	97%	97%	100%
Case manager to oversee treatment	49	53	44	42	56	75	75
Treatment plan for substance abuse	76	79	73	72	76	87	90
Special living units	9	3	3	11	19	36	55
None of above services provided	1	1	2	1	1	0	0

■ Of the facilities holding more than 200 residents that reported providing substance abuse services, all provided substance abuse education and were more likely than smaller facilities to have special living units in which all young persons have substance abuse offenses and/or problems.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

The majority of facilities that provided substance abuse counseling or therapy were most likely to provide services on an individual basis

Service provided	Total	Facility type						
		Detention center	Shelter	Reception/diagnostic center	Group home	Ranch/wilderness camp	Training school	Residential treatment center
Total facilities	1,852	664	143	61	360	37	176	726
Facilities reporting counseling	919	257	66	32	192	25	104	445
Individual	91%	89%	94%	88%	89%	96%	93%	93%
Group	86	78	80	75	86	92	91	90
Family	46	37	52	53	46	32	53	56
Facilities reporting therapy	1,131	287	93	38	252	28	147	545
Individual	96%	98%	96%	92%	97%	96%	96%	96%
Group	85	79	74	87	80	89	93	90
Family	48	47	58	58	46	39	54	53

■ In 2014, ranch/wilderness camps were most likely to provide individual counseling, and detention centers were most likely to provide individual therapy.

■ Ranch/wilderness camps were the most likely to provide group counseling, and 93% of training schools reported providing group therapy.

■ Almost half of all facilities provided family counseling or family therapy.

Note: Counts (and row percentages) may sum to more than the total number of facilities because facilities could select more than one facility type.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

Half of youth were in facilities where in-house mental health professionals assess all youth

In approximately 6 of 10 facilities, in-house mental health professionals evaluated all youth held

Facilities provided information about their procedures for evaluating youth's mental health needs. Among facilities that responded to mental health evaluation questions in 2014, 58% reported that they evaluated all youth for mental health needs, and 41% evaluated some but not all youth. Only 1% said that they did not evaluate any youth (either inside or outside the facility) during their stay.

In 2014, a greater proportion of privately operated than publicly operated facilities said that in-house mental health professionals evaluated all youth (80% vs. 52% of facilities reporting mental health evaluation information). However, in a greater proportion of public facilities than private facilities (48% vs. 20%), in-house mental health professionals evaluated some youth.

Evaluation by in-house mental health professional	Facility type	
	Public	Private
Total reporting facilities	801	544
All reporting facilities	100%	100%
All youth screened	52	80
Some youth screened	48	20

Facilities also identified themselves according to the type of treatment they provided (if any). Facilities that said they provided mental health treatment inside the facility were more likely than other facilities to have a mental health professional evaluate all youth (68% vs. 26% of

The largest facilities were most likely to have in-house mental health professionals evaluate all youth for mental health needs

In-house mental health evaluation	Facility size based on residential population						
	Total	1-10	11-20	21-50	51-100	101-200	201+
Total facilities	1,852	601	436	507	212	74	22
Facilities reporting	1,345	345	331	407	177	65	20
All reporting facilities	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All youth evaluated	63	70	62	58	61	72	80
Some youth evaluated	37	30	38	42	39	28	20

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

Group homes and residential treatment centers were more likely than other types of facilities to have in-house mental health professionals evaluate all youth for mental health needs

In-house mental health evaluation	Facility type						
	Detention center	Shelter	Reception/diagnostic center	Group home	Ranch/wilderness camp	Training school	Residential treatment center
Total facilities	664	143	61	360	37	176	726
Facilities reporting	530	86	53	176	29	159	574
All reporting facilities	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All youth evaluated	39	43	70	71	52	70	80
Some youth evaluated	61	57	30	29	48	30	20

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

those reporting mental health evaluation information).

Evaluation by in-house mental health professional	Onsite mental health treatment?	
	Yes	No
Total reporting facilities	1,206	139
All reporting facilities	100%	100%
All youth screened	68	26
Some youth screened	32	74

In 2014, JRFC asked facilities if they communicated information regarding the mental health status, services, and/or needs to the young person's new placement or residence; 81% of facilities said that they did. Most of these (74%) said that they communicated mental health status information for all youth departing the facility.

The most common approach to in-house mental health evaluation was to screen all youth by the end of their first day or first week at the facility

When youth are evaluated for mental health needs	Number of juvenile facilities			As a percentage of facilities that evaluated youth in-house for mental health needs		
	All facilities	All youth evaluated	Some youth evaluated	Facilities that evaluated	All youth evaluated	Some youth evaluated
Total facilities reporting	1,338	850	488	100%	64%	36%
Less than 24 hours	522	413	109	39	31	8
24 hours to 7 days	536	370	166	40	28	12
7 or more days	81	44	37	6	3	3
Other	199	23	176	15	2	13

■ In 59% of facilities that reported using an in-house mental health professional to perform mental health evaluations, they evaluated all youth for mental health needs by the end of their first week in custody.

Note: Percentage detail may not add up to total due to rounding. Seven facilities that reported youth were evaluated did not report when they were evaluated.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

Of facilities that reported using in-house mental health professionals to conduct mental health evaluations, 34% of justice-involved youth were in facilities that evaluated all youth on the day they arrived at the facility

When youth are evaluated for mental health needs	Number of justice-involved youth			As a percentage of justice-involved youth in facilities that provided in-house evaluation for mental health needs		
	All facilities	All youth evaluated	Some youth evaluated	Facilities that evaluated	All youth evaluated	Some youth evaluated
Total justice-involved youth residing in reporting facilities	41,554	26,286	15,268	100%	63%	37%
Less than 24 hours	17,843	13,942	3,901	43	34	9
24 hours to 7 days	14,757	9,836	4,921	36	24	12
7 or more days	1,932	1,172	760	5	3	2
Other	7,022	1,336	5,686	17	3	14

■ Facilities reporting that they evaluated all youth by the end of their first week held 58% of justice-involved youth who resided in facilities that reported using in-house mental health evaluation procedures.

Note: Percentage detail may not add up to total due to rounding.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

Most justice-involved youth were held in facilities that evaluate all youth for suicide risk on their first day

Facilities that screened all youth for suicide risk held 85% of the youth in custody

As part of the information collected on mental health services, the JRFC questionnaire asks facilities about their procedures regarding screening youth for suicide risk.

In 2014, 90% of facilities that reported information on suicide screening said that they evaluated all youth for suicide risk.

An additional 3% said that they evaluated some youth. Some facilities (7%) said that they did not evaluate any youth for suicide risk.

In 2014, a larger proportion of public than private facilities said that they evaluated all youth for suicide risk (97% vs. 82%).

In 2014, among facilities that reported suicide screening information, those that screened all youth for suicide risk held 94% of justice-involved youth who were in residential placement—up from 81% in

2002. An additional 1% of such youth in 2014 were in facilities that screened some youth.

Suicide screening	2002	2014
Total youth	102,235	50,821
Youth in reporting facilities	99,972	45,672
Total	100%	100%
All youth screened	81	94
Some youth screened	12	1
No youth screened	7	4

Note: Detail may not total 100% because of rounding. "Youth" refers to justice-involved youth.

Some facilities used trained counselors or professional mental health staff to conduct suicide screening

Less than half (44%) of facilities that screened some or all youth for suicide risk reported that mental health professionals with at least a master's degree in psychology or social work conducted the screenings. More than one-third (36%) used neither mental health professionals nor counselors whom a mental health professional had trained to conduct suicide screenings.

Facilities reported on the screening methods used to determine suicide risk. Facilities could choose more than one method. Of facilities that conducted suicide risk screening, a majority (76%) reported that they incorporated one or more questions about suicide in the medical history or intake process to screen youth; 43% used a form their facility designed, and 21% used a form or questions that a county or state juvenile justice system designed to assess suicide risk. More than 4 in 10 facilities (44%) reported using the Massachusetts Youth Screening Instrument (MAYSI)—35% reported

Suicide screening was common across facilities of all sizes

Suicide screening	Facility size based on residential population						
	Total	1–10	11–20	21–50	51–100	101–200	201+
Total facilities	1,852	601	436	507	212	74	22
Facilities reporting	1,631	514	393	452	182	68	22
All reporting facilities	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All youth screened	90	83	94	94	92	93	95
Some youth screened	3	4	2	1	2	3	0
No youth screened	7	13	4	4	5	4	5

Note: Column percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

Ranch/wilderness camps and group homes were the least likely to screen youth for suicide risk

Suicide screening	Facility type						
	Detention center	Shelter	Reception/diagnostic center	Group home	Ranch/wilderness camp	Training school	Residential treatment center
Total facilities	664	143	61	360	37	176	726
Facilities reporting	614	129	57	289	37	163	640
All reporting facilities	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All youth screened	98	91	95	75	76	96	89
Some youth screened	0	4	0	7	0	1	3
No youth screened	2	5	5	19	24	4	8

Note: Column percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

using the MAYSI full form, and 9% used the MAYSI suicide/depression module. Very few facilities (less than 1%) used the Voice Diagnostic Interview Schedule for Children.

Of facilities that reported screening youth for suicide risk, 86% reassessed youth at some point during their stay. Most facilities (90%) reported rescreening on a case-by-case basis or as necessary. An additional 34% of facilities also reported that rescreening occurred systematically and was based on a variety of factors (e.g., length of stay, facility events, or negative life events). Less than 1% of facilities did not reassess youth to determine suicide risk.

All facilities used some type of preventive measure once they determined a youth was at risk for suicide

Facilities that reported suicide screening information were asked a series of questions related to preventive measures taken for youth determined to be at risk for suicide. Of these facilities, 64% reported placing at-risk youth in sleeping or observation rooms that are locked or under staff security. Aside from using sleeping or observation rooms, 84% of facilities reported using line-of-sight supervision, 86% reported removing personal items that could be used to attempt suicide, and 72% reported using one-on-one or arm's-length supervision. Nearly half of facilities (46%) reported using special clothing to prevent suicide attempts, and 30% reported removing the youth from the general population. Twenty-one percent (21%) of facilities used restraints to prevent suicide attempts, and 19% of facilities used special clothing to identify youth at risk for suicide.

In 2014, the majority (93%) of justice-involved youth in facilities that screened for suicide risk were in facilities that conducted suicide screenings on all youth on the day they arrived

Suicide screening	When suicide risk screening occurs					Never or not reported
	Total	Less than 24 hours	24 hours to 7 days	7 days or more	Other	
Number of facilities:						
All	1,852	1,376	124	2	14	336
All youth screened	1,475	1,354	111	2	8	–
Some youth screened	41	22	13	0	6	–
Percentage of facilities that screened:						
Total	100%	91%	8%	0%	1%	–
All youth screened	97	89	7	0	1	–
Some youth screened	3	1	1	0	0	–
Number of justice-involved youth:						
In all facilities	50,821	40,814	2,585	35	207	7,180
In facilities that screened all youth	43,099	40,532	2,406	35	126	–
In facilities that screened some youth	542	282	179	0	81	–
Percentage of justice-involved youth:						
In facilities that screened all youth	100%	94%	6%	0%	0%	–
In facilities that screened some youth	99	93	6	0	0	–
In facilities that screened some youth	1	1	0	0	0	–

- More than 9 in 10 facilities (96%) that reported screening for suicide risk said they screened all youth by the end of the first week of their stay at the facility. A large portion (89%) said they screened all youth on their first day at the facility. These facilities accounted for 93% of justice-involved youth held in facilities that conducted suicide screenings.
- Very few facilities that reported screening for suicide risk reported that they conducted the screenings at some point other than within the first week of a youth's stay (1%). Facilities that conducted screenings within other time limits gave varying responses. For example, some facilities reported that screenings occurred as needed or as deemed necessary. Some reported that screenings were court ordered. A small number of facilities indicated that screenings occurred before the youth was admitted.

Note: Percentage detail may not add up to total due to rounding.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

JRFC asks facilities about certain activities that may have occurred in the month before the census date

In addition to information gathered on the census date, JRFC collects data on the following questions for the 30-day period of September 2014:

- Were there any unauthorized departures of any young persons who were assigned beds at this facility?
- Were any young persons assigned beds at this facility transported to a hospital emergency room by facility staff, transportation staff, or by an ambulance?
- Were any of the young persons assigned beds here restrained by facility staff with a mechanical restraint?
- Were any of the young persons assigned beds here locked for more than 4 hours alone in an isolation, seclusion, or sleeping room to regain control of their unruly behavior?

Illnesses were the most common reason for emergency room visits in the previous month

Reason for ER visit	Percentage of facilities
Total	34%
Injury	
Sports-related	39
Work/chore-related	3
Interpersonal conflict (between residents)	26
Interpersonal conflict (by nonresident)	5
Illness	41
Pregnancy	
Complications	3
Labor and delivery	0
Suicide attempt	11
Nonemergency	
No other health professional available	13
No doctor's appointment could be obtained	10
Other	17

Note: Percentages are based on facilities that reported emergency room information (179 of 1,852 facilities [10%] did not report).

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

One-fifth of facilities (20%) reported unauthorized departures in the month before the census date

Facility type	Number of facilities		Percentage of reporting facilities with unauthorized departures
	Total	Reporting	
Total facilities	1,852	1,634	20%
Detention center	664	614	4
Shelter	143	129	44
Reception/diagnostic center	61	57	11
Group home	360	293	32
Ranch/wilderness camp	37	37	19
Training school	176	162	7
Residential treatment center	726	640	30

■ Shelters and group homes were most likely to report one or more unauthorized departures.

Note: Detail may sum to more than the totals because facilities could select more than one facility type.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

Nearly equal proportions of facilities reported using mechanical restraints and locking youth in some type of isolation; use of these practices differed by facility type

Facility type	Percentage of reporting facilities	
	Used mechanical restraints	Locked youth in room for 4 or more hours
Total facilities	24%	23%
Detention center	43	47
Shelter	9	5
Reception/diagnostic center	40	23
Group home	2	1
Ranch/wilderness camp	32	11
Training school	62	46
Residential treatment center	15	10

■ Detention centers were the most likely type of facility to use mechanical restraints (i.e., handcuffs, leg cuffs, waist bands, leather straps, restraining chairs, strait jackets, or other mechanical devices) in the previous month. Detention centers and training schools were the most likely to lock a youth alone in some type of seclusion for 4 or more hours to regain control of their unruly behavior.

■ Group homes were the facility type least likely to use either of these measures.

Note: Percentages are based on 1,627 facilities that reported mechanical restraints information and locked isolation information, of a total of 1,852 facilities.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

Facilities reported eight deaths of youth in placement over 12 months—five were suicides

Youth in residential placement rarely died in custody

Facilities holding justice-involved youth reported that eight youth died while in the legal custody of the facility between October 1, 2013, and September 30, 2014. One facility reported two deaths.

Routine collection of national data on deaths of youth in residential placement began with the 1988–1989 Children in Custody (CIC) Census of Public and Private Juvenile Detention, Correctional, and Shelter Facilities. Accidents or suicides have usually been the leading cause of death. Over the years 1988–1994 (CIC data reporting years), an average of 46 deaths were reported nationally per year, including an annual average of 18 suicides. Over the years 2000–2014 (JRFC data reporting years), those averages dropped to 18 deaths overall and 7 suicides. In 2006, the number of suicides that occurred at residential facilities (four) was the lowest since OJJDP first started collecting data from JRFC in 2000. There were five suicides in 2014.

Residential treatment centers reported four of the eight deaths in 2014—one homicide and three suicides. This was the greatest number of deaths of all facility types. Training schools accounted for two deaths as the result of an illness and a suicide. Detention centers accounted for one death due to an unspecified cause. Group homes accounted for one of the eight deaths, a suicide.

During the 12 months prior to the census, suicides were the most commonly reported cause of death in residential placement

Cause of death	Total	Inside the facility			Outside the facility		
		All	Public	Private	All	Public	Private
Total	8	0	0	0	8	6	2
Suicide	5	0	0	0	5	4	1
Illness/natural	1	0	0	0	1	1	0
Homicide	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
Other/unknown	1	0	0	0	1	1	0

■ In 2014, no deaths occurred inside the facility.

Notes: Data are reported deaths of youth in custody from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014. None of the deaths from illness were AIDS related.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

In 2014, the death rate was generally higher for public facilities than for private facilities

Cause of death	Deaths per 10,000 youth held on the census date, October 22, 2014		
	Total	Public facility	Private facility
Total	1.6	1.7	1.4
Suicide	1.0	1.1	0.7
Illness/natural	0.2	0.3	0.0
Homicide	0.2	0.0	0.7
Other	0.2	0.3	0.0

Type of facility	Deaths per 10,000 youth held on the census date, October 22, 2014		
	Total	Public facility	Private facility
Detention center	0.4	0.5	0.0
Training school	1.6	1.8	0.0
Group home	2.5	0.0	3.2
Residential treatment center	2.1	3.9	0.9

■ The death rate in 2014 (1.6) was lower than that in 2000 (2.8). Of the 30 reported deaths of youth in residential placement in 2000, accidents were the most commonly reported cause. In 2014, suicides were the most commonly reported cause of death.

Note: Data are reported deaths of youth in custody from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014. None of the deaths from illness were AIDS related.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

Of the total deaths in residential placement (eight), five involved white non-Hispanic males and one involved black non-Hispanic males

Race/ethnicity	Cause of death									
	Total		Suicide		Illness/natural		Homicide		Other	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Total	6	2	4	1	1	0	1	0	0	1
White non-Hispanic	5	1	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Black non-Hispanic	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hispanic	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Other race/ethnicity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note: Data are reported deaths of youth in custody from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014.

Source: Authors' analysis of *Juvenile Residential Facility Census 2014* [machine-readable data file].

Generally, suicides did not occur in the first days of a youth's stay

Most suicides in the reporting period occurred months after admission. One suicide occurred 2 months after admission, one occurred 4 months after admission, and another occurred 9 months after admission. One suicide occurred approximately 2 years after admission, and the remaining suicide occurred 3 years after admission. The least number of days since admission for deaths was the death from an unspecified cause that occurred within 24 hours of admission. The overall median number of days since admission for deaths of youth in placement was 95.

JRFC asks facilities about deaths of young persons at locations inside or outside the facility

During the year between October 1, 2013, and September 30, 2014, did any young persons die while assigned to a bed at this facility at a location either inside or outside of this facility?

If yes, how many young persons died while assigned beds at this facility during the year between October 1, 2013, and September 30, 2014?

What was the cause of death?

- Illness/natural causes (excluding AIDS)
- Injury suffered prior to placement here

- AIDS
- Suicide
- Homicide by another resident
- Homicide by nonresident(s)
- Accidental death
- Other (specify)

What was the location of death, age, sex, race, date of admission to the facility, and date of death for each young person who died while assigned a bed at this facility?

The Juvenile Residential Facility Census includes data that tribal facilities submitted

OJJDP works with the Bureau of Indian Affairs to ensure a greater representation of tribal facilities in the CJRP and JRFC data collections. As a result, the 2014 JRFC collected data from 13 tribal facilities. The tribal facilities were in Arizona, Colorado, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Oklahoma, and South Dakota and held 133 youth charged with or adjudicated for an offense (down from 188 in 2014).

Tribal facilities were asked what agency owned and/or operated their facilities; 11 reported ownership information. The tribe owned and operated each facility;

however, three of these facilities also indicated that the federal government owned them.

All 13 tribal facilities identified themselves as detention centers. Tribal facilities were small, most holding 50 or fewer residents; 62% of justice-involved youth were held at facilities that held between 11 and 20 residents. On the census day, almost all facilities (11) were operating at less than their standard bed capacity and the remaining 2 facilities were operating at capacity. Standard bed capacities ranged from 10 to 198; only 1 facility had more than 100 standard beds.

Eleven of the 13 tribal facilities reported locking youth in their sleeping rooms. Among tribal facilities that locked youth in their rooms, nine did so at night. An equal number of facilities (eight) locked youth in their rooms when the youth was out of control or when youth were in their sleeping rooms. Six facilities locked youth in their rooms during shift changes and five facilities did so for a part of each day. Three facilities locked youth in their rooms when they were deemed suicidal. Finally, one facility stated there was no set schedule for locking youth in rooms.

Other OJJDP data collection efforts describe youth in residential placement

JRFC is one component in a multi-tiered effort to describe the youth placed in residential facilities and the facilities themselves. Other components include:

National Juvenile Court Data

Archive: Collects information on sanctions that juvenile courts impose.

Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement:

Collects information on the demographics and legal attributes of each youth in a juvenile facility on the census date.

Survey of Youth in Residential Placement:

Collected a broad range of self-reported information from interviews in 2003 with individual youth in residential placement.

Resources

OJJDP's online Statistical Briefing Book (SBB) offers access to a wealth of information about youth crime and victimization and about youth involved in the juvenile justice system. Visit the "Juveniles in Corrections" section of the SBB at ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/corrections/faqs.asp for the latest information about youth in corrections. **Easy Access to the Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement** is a data analysis tool that gives users quick access to national data on the characteristics of youth held in residential placement facilities and contains a large set of predefined tables detailing the characteristics of justice-involved youth in residential placement facilities.

Data sources

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. 2001, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2013, and 2015. *Juvenile Residential Facility Census* for the years 2000, 2002, 2004, 2006, 2008, 2010, 2012, and 2014 [machine-readable data files]. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau (producer).

Acknowledgments

This bulletin was written by Sarah Hockenberry and Andrew Wachter, Research Associates, and Anthony Sladky, Senior Computer Programmer, with assistance from Melissa Sickmund, Director, at the National Center for Juvenile Justice, with funds provided by OJJDP to support the National Juvenile Justice Data Analysis Project.

This bulletin was prepared under grant number 2013-MU-FX-0005 from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice.

Points of view or opinions expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of OJJDP or the U.S. Department of Justice.

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Assistance; the Bureau of Justice Statistics; the National Institute of Justice; the Office for Victims of Crime; and the Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking.

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
8660 Cherry Lane
Laurel, MD 20707-4651



PRESORTED STANDARD
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
DOJ/OJJDP/GPO
PERMIT NO. G - 26

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use \$300

